


E 756
.G13

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



00001734295





AMERICA IN THE ORIENT.

THE UNITED STATES, RUSSIA AND FRANCE AND THE ANGLO-JAPANESE TREATY.

By T. ST. JOHN GAFFNEY and JOSEPH SMITH.

Professor Grosvenor, of Amherst College, on the Policy of the State Department.

Reprinted from
THE BOSTON PILOT.

RUSSIA, THE UNITED STATES AND THE ANGLO-JAPANESE TREATY.

There is a class in this Republic more British than American, whose chief object is to direct the foreign policy of the United States in England's interest, no matter what the result may be to the Republic. This class, small but noisy, has its press agents and its after dinner advocates, but the average American knows how small is its real influence when weighed in the balance of public opinion and how futile must necessarily be its efforts. During the last four years it was particularly in evidence, disseminating the falsehood that Great Britain stood between us and the Continental Powers during the Spanish War. The persistent and systematic circulation of this lie was so general as to affect the judgment of many honest and patriotic Americans, who forthwith joined the troop of Anglomani, whose voice made the welkin ring with the story of our obligations to Mr. Chamberlain's ministry. France, Russia and Germany endured in silence for four years this impeachment of their good faith, and Lord Pauncefoot strutted around Washington in the guise of our protector and saviour, while our State Department practically abdicated its functions and became the echo of the British Foreign Office. A change, however, has come over the scene; although Hay still holds the State portfolio,

an American sits in the chair at Washington. The Secretary of State, whether justly or unjustly, it is not for me to say, is regarded as the exponent and defender of British policies in this country. It has been alleged by many eminent public men that if he were to change places with Lord Pauncefoot he could not be more careful and vigilant in looking out for the interests of the British Empire.

Since the commencement of the South African War all negotiations have been conducted with one view by our State Department, and that to cause the least offence to the Chamberlain ministry, no matter how our interests in Alaska or elsewhere might suffer. Great Britain must not be embarrassed has been the governing and paramount rule in our diplomatic affairs since the induction of the Hon. John Hay. As the result of such a programme, humiliating as the confession is, this great nation has become an acquiescing partner in the spoliation and destruction of two small republics. History does not record a more shameful episode in our annals, and the judgment of posterity will, with unerring fidelity, place the brand of shame on Columbia's brow for our conduct in this infamous South African War.

Since the signing of the Anglo-Japanese Treaty the voice of the

Anglomen in America has been again raised. They assert with positiveness that their friend Hay was consulted and gave his tacit adhesion to the document, and that he would gladly have made our country a party but for the United States Senate. The British press here and abroad re-echo the statement, and the Secretary of State is silent. He remains dumb, as he has during the last four years, when at any hour during that time he could have unmasked the duplicity of the British Government and spared the ministers of the great Powers the humiliations and affronts to which they have been subjected up to the very moment of Pancefote's exposure.

The Japanese newspapers do not hesitate to openly claim that our Government is an unofficial party to the convention.

The "Mainichi" (Osaka), one of the leading organs of public opinion, says:

"The contracting Powers are Great Britain and Japan on paper, but there is also the unofficial American support of the alliance. It is an alliance of the three Powers which hold the balance of power in the Far East, in commerce, in navigation, and in naval and military strength. The three Powers in combination can defy the world, and we do not hesitate to assert that their alliance is sufficient to guarantee the peace of the world."

In contributions to *The Pilot* I have frequently called attention to the press campaign conducted in the interest of Britain by her agents resident among us. Some of these, I regret to say, are American; in fact, the most notorious member of

the craft was born in this country. There is also an Anglo Jew, the Washington correspondent of the London "Chronicle," who has a faculty of quoting his own dispatches to that paper in the columns of a Boston paper, of which he is also the correspondent. These men are ever vigilant and unceasingly active in their efforts to create ill feeling between the United States and the Continental Powers, and rumor attributes to them opportunities for information at the State Department afforded no other correspondents. There is also a certain element in Congress which is committed to the British interest, and at every opportunity, either at dinners or by interviews, it delivers empty talks about "Blood is thicker than water," "Our kith and kin," "the open door," and such silly nonsense as is calculated to arouse instead of allay any bitterness of feeling between the two peoples.

The best ethnological authorities, both here and abroad, credit our homogeneous population with about 10 per cent. of English blood, and as time progresses this fraction is becoming more minute, and yet there are idiots who refer to the American people as a branch of the "Anglo-Saxon" race.

The Hon. Chauncey M. Depew is a sample of this class of Anglo-maniac, but every one knows that his pleasantries on international questions are worthy of no serious consideration. The foreign ministers, after a brief residence among us, weigh these utterances at their proper value, and although European newspapers and foreign governments may attach some signifi-

cance to them, they are regarded here as of absolutely no political importance.

Orators of this type constantly prate of spreading the beneficent influences of English civilization. Let us contrast for a moment just one feature of the civilization of the Boer and the Briton. The Boers have captured and released since the commencement of the war 38,000 British soldiers, which is more than the entire strength of the Boer army. Upwards of 5,000 of these prisoners were for months in their hands. Up to the fall of Pretoria only two deaths had occurred among these troops during their captivity and about half a dozen suffered from minor ailments. Great Britain, under the pretence that they are rebels, has shot and hanged many Boer officers and soldiers, scattered the prisoners over the world and, having burned the homes of the women and children, has placed them in camps where the death rate has reached the appalling figures of 450 per thousand. Her object and policy is the extermination of the race, and yet we have in this country men like Alfred T. Mahan who have the assurance to glorify British benevolence and proclaim that British prestige has been increased by the South African War. Is it any wonder that Captain Mahan was court-martialed while in the American Navy and that the verdict recorded that he was incompetent to sail his own ship?

The Anglo-Japanese Treaty.

The Anglo-Japanese Alliance, followed after a brief interval by the

Russo-French Declaration, marks the beginning of a new period in world politics. The centre of gravity has been transferred from the near to the far East, and the field of action from the Ottoman to the Chinese Empire. As in the earlier stages of the demolition of the power of the Turk, the two great antagonists were Russia and England, so we again find them with visors down and lances in rest opposed to each other on the shores of the Yellow Sea. Now, however, France is the ally of Russia, while heathen Japan, whose association with Christian Britain many leading Englishmen declared a few years ago to be unthinkable, is now united to her by the closest tie known in international relations. Again, as during the long struggle between Russia and England in the near East, we find Germany playing the same part of an apparently disinterested spectator, or, as Bismarck described it, of the honest broker. Now, however, the issue of the struggle in the near East cannot be repeated. The change of the field of action has brought a new factor into play, and what was only a European question when the Ottoman Empire was concerned is a world question when the destiny of China comes to be fixed, and one in which this country has a vital interest, as one of the great Powers territorially dominating the Northern Pacific. The others are Russia and Japan, with the possibility of China, if it can preserve its integrity and evolve a modern form of government, becoming a fourth. The locus standi of the other Powers is commercial and financial, and can

only become territorial at the expense of China or of the other three Powers.

As the right of issue on the ocean was the keynote of Russian policy in the near East, so an ice-free port is of her movement through Manchuria to the Yellow Sea; and only a country whose policy is always and everywhere that of the dog-in-the-manger would refuse her that right or bar her progress. It is hardly necessary to say that England is the country implied; but by herself England would be powerless to accomplish her aim and gratify her secular hatred of Russia; and the European Powers are much too intimately acquainted with the utter selfishness and the duplicity of her diplomacy to aid her. So in her despair she turns to the child of the world's old age, Japan, to hold up her arm, palsied by the valorous resistance of two little South African Republics. With the attractive bait of the "open door" she would enlist the commercial ambitions of this country in her service against Russia, but the memories of the American people would be short indeed and their intelligence dim if they could forget the story of the scene in the British Embassy at Washington in 1898, when, with customary double-dealing, the British Ambassador endeavored to lure his colleagues into consenting to a step which would have amounted to a European intervention between ourselves and Spain.

This country is strong enough and just enough to do what is right in the question raised by the formation of the Anglo-Japanese alliance.

Russia is not and never has been our enemy, while the interests of both require that we should be friends. Commercially, Japan is bound in the nature of things to be our greatest rival in the Eastern markets so soon as her industries and mercantile marine are more fully developed; and we must ever bear in mind that the Japanese can never forgive us for having supplanted them in the Philippines, the heritage they coveted whenever those islands should fall from the feeble grasp of Spain.

With Russia we can and ought to treat to the advantage and profit of both; with England and Japan, never. The consistent perfidiousness of the one and the disappointed ambition of the other forbid. Until she has her teeth out of South Africa, England is impotent alike as an enemy or an ally; and it would be as poor policy as it would be immoral for this country to aid the destroyer of two republics and the exterminator of brave men, their wives and children. Were we to help England and Japan to-morrow to force Russia back from the open sea into the frozen North, we should have to fight Japan the day after to retain the foothold we now have on the borders of the Asiatic market, touching nobody's territory and touched by none, while England, with habitual duplicity, would be professing sympathy with the one she feared the most and helping the other.

Let our watchword ever be no Anglo-American Alliance; no Anglo-American-Japanese understanding. If England and Japan force a war upon Russia and

France, now openly declaring themselves allies, let us stand aside and see fair play; which will also, without a doubt, be the attitude of Germany.

Russia's Historic Friendship for the United States.

It is proper, in discussing Russia's relations toward this country, to review briefly her past attitude toward the United States. Since the birth of this republic the friendship of the Czar has been shown at many a critical juncture. Russia was the only great power which did not recognize the belligerency of the Confederacy. In 1863 the Russian fleets anchored in New York and San Francisco harbors under sealed orders to support the United States in the event of any interference by England in behalf of the South. After the triumph of the Union armies she sold us Alaska for a nominal sum, thereby voluntarily eliminating the American Continent from the sphere of Russian colonization or territorial expansion. How gladly would England have paid four times the purchase price if she had the opportunity is now admitted by all historians. It is therefore not inappropriate that we Americans allude to Russia as our traditional friend.

The New York Sun, in an article published some time ago, forcibly sets forth the common aims and ambitions of Russia and our republic. The Sun said:

"The Russians and Americans have now behind them three generations of effort substantially iden-

tical in aim and in achievement; both have before them a manifest destiny containing much that is in common and nothing that conflicts. Russia has been and is the greatest civilizer of the Old World, as the Americans have been of the New, reducing again to the uses of the human race vast territories that had been for centuries sacrificed to the savagery of degenerated barbarism. In the Eastern Mediterranean Russia, in obedience to the dictates of a human heart sensitive to pulsations other than those of a loom, has twice poured out her blood and treasure to rescue fellow creatures from the knife of the butcher and the cord of the ravisher. Throughout the whole of this career, alike in that part of it which has dealt with the redemption of territorial areas, and in that part dealing with the redemption of the human victims of fanaticism, cruelty and lust, Russia has had one single, steady, consistent opponent. Splashed to the thighs with innocent blood, England has barred the way."

In considering the Asiatic situation and our relation thereto there are singular advantages which Russia possesses and which should have weight with our Government in its future policy. First of all, as I have mentioned before, comes the alliance with France, our sister republic. This alliance has received renewed assurance from the Franco-Russian note of March 20, which contains the following significant paragraph:

"They (Russia and France) are compelled, however, not to lose from view the possibly inimical ac-

tion of other Powers, or a repetition of disorders in China, possibly impairing China's integrity and free development, to the detriment of their reciprocal interests. They therefore reserve to themselves the right to take measures to defend these interests."

This rather sharp reminder to the wise has been followed by an official statement by the Czar's government. Among the points set forth in this are the following: That Russia is not worried by the Anglo-Japanese alliance; that the principles which have guided Russia since the late war occurred still hold good; that she will insist on the integrity of China, and also of Corea; and that she has in view only the preservation of the status quo and the general peace, in the construction of the Siberian railroad.

The pro-British press here refers to the belated conversion of Russia to the open door principle. As a matter of fact, nearly two years ago our Government received a most positive assurance from Count Cassini, the Czar's brilliant representative at Washington, on this subject, as well as the other points enumerated in the note of March 20. There was never any doubt in the mind of President McKinley as to the good faith of Russia on this question, and since the accession of President Roosevelt the most cordial understanding has prevailed between the two governments.

The "Official Messenger," St. Petersburg, in publishing the Franco-Russian declaration, March 20, relative to the Anglo-Japanese Convention, accompanied it with a final statement which contains a well-de-

served rebuke to those who have been so offensively active in misrepresenting Russia's position.

"The intention expressed by Great Britain and Japan to attain those same objects, which have invariably been pursued by the Russian Government, can meet with nothing but sympathy in Russia, in spite of the comments in certain political spheres and in some of the foreign newspapers which endeavored to present in quite a different light the impassive attitude of the Imperial Government toward a diplomatic act which in its eye does not change in any way the general situation on the political horizon."

Referring again to the advantages which Russia possesses in Asia, we must also consider the fact that for centuries she has been a semi-Asiatic Power in close intercourse with Orientals, and it is natural that Russian methods of government, arbitrary and despotic as they may seem to us, may be better adapted than those of more liberally governed nations to political conditions existing in China. The building of the great Continental railway and the pacific character of her policy for many years are further reasons why there should be no sympathy by the United States with her enemies and that there should be no interruption of our traditional friendship.

It should not be forgotten also that Russia does not seek to interfere with the religion of the Chinese people and employs no missionaries with that end in view. As most of the trouble with the Christian Powers has arisen from the offensive activity of missionaries, this

advantage to Russia should not be lost sight of, and I regard it as of the highest significance.

The Hon. John W. Bookwalter, former Governor of Ohio, who has travelled extensively in Russia, says: "America's best open door to Central Asia and China is through Russia, and our obtaining the virtual monopoly of this market only depends on our retaining her friendship. America has very little to gain by an open door to China. Russia in the last four years has done more to open the door of China than England and the rest of the world have done in fifty years. No one who has not seen it with his own eyes can have the faintest conception of what Russia has done and is still doing in Central Asia. I distrust the friendship of England and advise, above all, the cultivation of friendship with France, Russia and Germany."

"The maintenance of friendly relations with Russia," says former Assistant Secretary of State Quincy, "should be as cardinal a point in our diplomatic policy as the cultivation of similar relations with us in her own programme. Each nation has expanded across the continent from one ocean to another; we meet as friends upon the shores of the Pacific, the great arena in which perhaps is to be fought out, in war or in peace, the struggle for political or commercial supremacy."

There is little doubt that a conflict in Asia is inevitable in the near future. In view of the critical conditions prevailing there, perhaps it would be of interest to note the difference between the position of Russia and England on that conti-

nent. The Asiatic dependencies of the British Empire are merely for the purpose of bringing in revenue to the home government and wealth to the small transitory population which passes a few years in Hindoostan or China. These British possessions are what the French call "*colonies d'exploitation*," as contrasted with "*colonies de peuplement*." The proportion of Britishers in the Indian Empire after two centuries of occupation is a mere fraction of the whole population. Russia, on the contrary, is a colonizing power. As she has extended the boundaries of her empire she has settled the new territories with permanent Russian colonists. In the wake of her advancing army villages, towns and churches have sprung up and the native population has been rapidly assimilated and Christianized by her European subjects. Wherever the Russians have founded colonies in Asia they have spread their language, civilization and religion. The provinces of Caucasia, where a century ago there was not a single Russian; Siberia, which two generations ago was practically devoid of European colonists and peopled by wandering aboriginal tribes, will before long be as Russian as any European province of the Czar's empire. Russia, instead of scattering her surplus population in North and South America, as is the case with England, Germany and Italy, carefully keeps this surplus within the confines of her own territory.

Nothing could be more disastrous than to embark American interests in the English bottom, for wherever the Union Jack floats

there American commerce withers and is rooted out. On the other hand, as I have before indicated, American and Russian commercial interests are identical. Both are growers and exporters of cereals and fibre, of which England is buyer, and her permanent interest is to pay as little as possible for these materials. She has systematically and constantly manipulated the identical produce of her old Asiatic possessions to break the world's market for these raws. She must needs continue to do so, a necessity imposed by her industrial position. The interests, then, of Russia and the United States alike are permanently and irreconcilably opposite to England's and are identical with one another.

In conclusion, I again quote from the "New York Sun," which up to a recent date more accurately represented American opinion on this subject than any other publication.

"Upon another and a higher plane of politics and humanity Russia is the great civilizer of Asia, while England merely enslaves, crushes and drains. England does so administer her great farms, her dependencies, as to increase their rental, the revenue she squeezes from them. But this is done at the cost of the abasement of the people, their abandonment to the torture of chicane, their brutification beneath the blight of hopeless poverty and the ever-impending shadow of starvation. Public health is

utterly neglected; there is not in all India such a seat of science and original research as Russia had established within five years of her acquisition of Samarcand, whose ancient Mogul University she restored. To Asiatics the absolute form of government alone is adapted. They welcome the easy and advantageous Russian yoke, which to them is the symbol and the warrant of security and prosperity."

No other element in our country but the Anglo-American has attempted to use the Republic. This faction is the least loyal to the United States and the most unscrupulous in its resolve to further the ends of British policy, no matter what the consequences may be to us. As the result of its deliberate efforts during the last four years to embroil us with the Continental Powers, our citizens of German and Irish extraction have come to a sympathetic understanding to stand together, irrespective of party, against British intrigue. Any administration that would endeavor to commit our Republic to a support of British interests in China would be overwhelmed by the weight of popular opprobrium.

Russia need not be disturbed in regard to the attitude of America, if for the protection of her interests she finds it obligatory to prick the bubble of British power in Asia as a few Dutch farmers have burst it in South Africa.

T. ST. JOHN GAFFNEY.

IMPENDING WORLD WAR.---ENGLAND AND JAPAN AGAINST RUSSIA AND FRANCE.

The offensive and defensive treaty entered into recently between England and Japan, ostensibly for the preservation of what is diplomatically termed the "Open Door" in China, is a document which has more than a passing interest for America and Americans. It was announced with a flourish that this treaty meant the conservation of the peace in the Orient, that it insured free trade and equal rights to the commerce of all nations, and that it made certain the political integrity of the Chinese Empire. There was an assumption of political and commercial altruism in this sonorous announcement that pleased international philanthropists and members of the Peace Society all round the world; but the hard-headed men of affairs, who have in their keeping the diplomatic relations of the Powers and who have learned to differentiate a hawk from a heron, merely smiled, for they had a long and intimate acquaintance with the two altruists who had issued the proclamation. England, the persistent plunderer and bullier of the Flowery Land, and Japan, recently arrested while imitating her friend and ally—these were the two altruists who were to be the guides, philosophers and friends of the guileless Chinaman, his guardians and protectors, the high-minded friends of peace, who were anxious only to keep open the

Chinese ports and keep free and equal the trade of China for all comers. Altruism could certainly go no further.

This was the overture to the international symphony of commerce; and it is now time for the audience to look for what musicians call the leit motif in the composition, or, as vulgar Americans say, "to look for the nigger in the woodpile."

The sudden outbreak of inspired articles in the pro-British press of America, questioning the good faith of the Russian Government's assurances that, as far as it was concerned, the "open door" would be preserved, and impudently asserting that America was back of the treaty, give a clue to the new intrigue in which the British Government is engaged. Those who have followed the tortuous course of British scheming since 1898, and the strenuous efforts of England and her impudent journalistic allies to discredit our hereditary friends, France, Russia and Germany, do not propose to allow her old intrigue to get a new foothold, even while masquerading under a new disguise. The British game now is to try and educate the people of America into the belief that the Anglo-Japanese treaty is an American treaty; that this administration will give it its aid and support; and, lastly, to discredit Russian aims and Russian good faith by persistent

slander and falsehood. This is the British programme in a nutshell, and the British count on three factors to make it successful: first, the careless credulity of the average American; second, the sympathy and silence of John Hay; third, the impudence, audacity and persistence of the pro-British press. Unless the Japanese-English treaty has the support, moral or physical, of the United States, it is not worth the paper it is written on; and it is the duty of every right-minded American to see that neither British intrigue nor Cabinet treachery gives it that support.

Stripped of its fine feathers, its sham altruism, the treaty is merely an ineffectual attempt of two little fellows to bluff one big one; it is England and Japan making faces at Russia, in default of being able to do anything worse. England is trying to make the world believe that she and Japan together amount to a very formidable force; yet the mathematical truth remains that twice nothing is still nothing, for England plus Japan, and Japan plus England, are still the original quantity—nothing. Yet these nothings hope to intimidate the strong, resourceful Russia, the one genuine guarantee of peace, progress, civilization, law and order in Asia—provided always they can cajole Uncle Sam to become a partner in their scheme.

Let us face the actual facts in the East, the realities of the situation. Russia has built a railroad practically from St. Petersburg to Vladivostock, in Eastern Siberia, and is running a branch line down through Manchuria to Port Arthur.

This railroad is a civilizing agency, which makes for peaceful conditions along its route, for the cessation of the barbarism and petty warfare which have retarded the growth and expansion of Northern China. Russia in her Eastern progress has transformed Khiva, Bokhara and the regions of her influence from anarchy and retrogression into lands where peace and prosperity reign and life and property are secure. She found wildernesses and deserts where she planted her flag, and has changed them into gardens; where disorder and misrule were the conditions of life she has given law, civilization, peace and good order. She is the one European Power whose authority in Asia is strong, firm and successful, since she is the one Power whose rulers understand the Asiatic.

Russia's True Friendship.

Her entry into Manchuria meant the re-creation of that region and its incorporation into the family of civilized nations; and having planted there the seeds of civilization she has a right to expect the harvest. From the first, America has been her partner in this good work, not officially, but commercially, for she has thrown open her markets freely to the American manufacturer and trader. She has time and again given assurances of her friendship and good will for Americans; her commercial policy toward America has been the positive and practical translation of her promises; and America has learned to have perfect confidence in the bona fides of the Russian Empire. Russia in her civilizing progress in Eastern Asia has

found the complement of her work in the peaceful agencies of American manufacture and commerce. Our most active and jealous rivals in these new fields of commercial exploitation are the British and Japanese manufacturers who see in our success their ruin. American business men are neither fools nor dupes; and they are not likely to be humbugged by any treaties or promises their envious commercial rivals may make. Hence, when the pro-British and anti-American (the terms are synonymous) press of America, from Boston to San Francisco, assures us that England and Japan are working for the benefit of American traders, we know exactly what value to place on their utterances, since British commercial altruism is such a rare and precious commodity. When England was ramming opium down Chinese throats at the point of the bayonet, when she was engaged in grabbing Chinese territory and bullying and bribing concessions from the weak and corrupt mandarinates, we feel certain that her sole thought was for her dear American commercial rivals!

Japan is a newcomer in the industrial field and in the struggle for political place and power. She has superimposed a thin veneer of European civilization upon her Oriental culture and has rushed into armaments, naval and military, until her finances are shaky. Her ill-paid, ill-fed swarms of pagans are working in strenuous competition to Europe and America, and she regards the markets of China as hers by right, to be obtained now by fine words and later by the sword, when

she is strong enough. Her ambition is to be the England of the Orient, the trader and bully of those seas. England sees in this polished pagan a handy tool to annoy Russia on the mainland and America on the sea; she would make, if possible, of Japan a pistol pointed at America's head. If Japan can work out her ambitions alone, well and good; but it would be the veriest folly for the United States to help build up a pugnacious and aggressive empire on her flank and to allow our ideals of civilization to be driven out and supplanted in the East by a belligerent community antagonistic to the ideas and doctrines we hold to be necessary for the world's well-being. Russia stands for Christian civilization; Japan for pagan materialism; Russia spells humanity and progress; Japanese dominance means an attempt to turn back the wheels of time. America cannot afford to line up with Anglo-Japan; she must stick to her old policy of avoiding entangling alliances, and keep herself free from any thing and all things bearing the brand of Britain. It is for us to remain in peace and amity with our tried and true friends and to beware of the Greeks bearing gifts.

The superserviceable friends of England in office and in the press are endeavoring strenuously to foster the idea that Russia's word is valueless and her friendship for America a delusion; such a campaign is necessarily offensive to Russia and injurious to this Republic; hence the importance of showing the real meaning and significance of this campaign of falsehood and misrepresentation, and of let-

ting the Russians know that the allies of England are numerically unimportant, politically powerless and socially insignificant in this country; and that the vigor of their efforts is dependent wholly upon the length and depth of the British purse.

As the pro-British campaign is now in full swing and its recklessness and violence are at their height, it might be well to stop and consider its purpose at this particular moment.

The Anglo-Japanese treaty in itself is not of first importance, since it is alleged to have purposes to which all the great Powers are pledged—the integrity of China. If we may judge from the utterances of the wiser and less reckless portion of the British press, it is an instrument fraught with danger and disaster for England. The Japanese have an army and navy which are a heavy burden on their finances; they are cocky, pugnacious and anxious to use them on somebody; their courage is far in excess of their prudence or discretion; and they are ready to drag their new and shaky ally into hostilities. In the present military and financial condition of England, Japan's war-like zeal is worse than embarrassing.

Japan Will Be Spanked.

Russia has looked beyond the treaty to the utterances of these allies and accepts the document as a challenge, and when Russia reaches that stage there is trouble ahead for somebody. The Government of the Czar has not been idle; it has been preparing for the struggle which it considers inevitable, and when it

strikes it will strike hard, fast and effectively.

Because of the prospect of war, it is the business of the United States to stand firmly aloof and let the allies get what is coming to them. We want to give England a fine sample of benevolent neutrality, an attitude which will enable us to receive our lost command of the seas and its carrying trade, which were filched from us by England during the Rebellion.

It will be Russia and France against England and Japan, with a battle-ground all round the world. England's military prestige is gone; if we are to believe Admiral Beresford, her naval prestige is likely to go the same road, since the majority of her ships are old and obsolete types. With India, Africa, Ireland and her other possessions to watch against eager and active enemies, England will not be in much of a position to keep her ally, who will be left very much to her own resources. Financially Japan will be in a bad way, as she depends on England to finance the situation. England's own financial condition is not the best; her debt is increasing by leaps and bounds; she shows a deficit in her revenues this year of \$100,000,000; her consols are down to 88, and her capacity to borrow is not what it was. Japan's ability for mischief will be limited at the best to a couple of months, and unless she accomplish something in that time she must collapse. Russia will be just beginning to fight by that time, and those who fight her must do it on the ground of her own choosing, and she knows how to choose. India, financially hard up,

can be set aflame in a month and British sovereignty threatened.

Meantime France will be heard from. Her swift cruisers, with French and Russian letters of marque, can light a torch with British commerce all round the seven seas, as well as pen her army up in South Africa, with interrupted communications and a wrecked system of supplies. If the French naval programme be followed, her battle-ships will keep to the fortified harbors of France, while her numerous and splendid submarine fleet will play havoc with England's channel fleet. That fleet once crippled, or demoralized, it will be surprising if a French army does not dictate terms on British soil. Meantime, with industries crippled and food supplies scarce and dear, England will be a dangerous and unhappy land, with an ignorant, debased and hungry population.

Under such pleasing conditions such neutrals as America and Germany would reap the just rewards of neutrality—the trade of the world and the pleasant opportunity of selling all hands war material for cash. Those robust American patriots whose conscience and patriotism are centred in their cash tills will do well to restrain their pro-British ardor in view of this alluring prospect, and stand aloof in the virtuous consciousness of duty well done. The ordinary American, who has a memory and recalls the vicissitudes through which his country has passed, will have no difficulty in remembering what Power was our enemy and what one our friend in the hour of trial; and that America will hold fast to the friend

who never failed us—Russia—and say "Get thee behind me, Satan!" to the hypocrite, who never missed a chance to injure us—England.

When the storm bursts in the East, as burst it will, a very pretty fight will be on, and when the curtain goes down on it, Japan will awake rudely from her dreams of empire and England will have reached the end of her tether.

The recent announcement by the Governments of Russia and France in answer to the bluff of the Anglo-Japanese treaty is significant and dignified and has back of it the heavy hand of those Powers. It is a warning to England and Japan that France and Russia stand ready to give them all the fight they need whenever they want it, and possibly before they want it. It must also put strength into the arms and courage into the hearts of that gallant little band in South Africa which has dealt the most serious blow to English pride and prestige the century has seen. A little longer, a few more sacrifices, and the British wolf will be past fighting. To such straits have the fighting Boers brought England, that she enters eagerly into this perilous treaty with the Jap, in a vain effort to guard her endangered interests elsewhere. Perilous indeed is the treaty which carries with it the dark shadow of the greatest empire on earth.

More Work for the Paid Journalists.

Meantime the campaign of slander and vilification of Russia goes bravely on in the mercenary pro-British press, and it is the duty of true Americans to treat it with

scorn and to repudiate that press and its falsehoods with indignation and contempt. The vigilance and prompt action of the friends of America can render this new intrigue as vain and humiliating as the one just about to close with the retirement of Lord Panncefote from America. The "Friendship Fake" has proven an ignominious failure, a humiliating defeat for British diplomacy and intrigue; but no one is foolish enough to imagine that the creatures who coddled and exploited that scheme will be less industrious in this new issue. The "New York Tribune," the "New York Times," the "Mail and Express," the Boston "Herald," the Cleveland "Plain Dealer," certain Chicago papers, the unspeakable Smalley, Abe Low, Juliananias Ralph, and all their breed and generation, will still keep up their pro-British and anti-Russian campaign, for with them it is simply business; the interests of the Republic are not as important to them as the contributions to their pockets. We can confidently look forward from now on to a rare catalogue of massacres in Russian China, Russian insults to America, Russian custom-house exactions, massacres of Russian students, outrages on Jews, education, religion, etc., and all the stock of antique lies which are used to discredit Russia. Simultaneously we shall read of England's efforts to foster American trade in the Ori-

ent; we shall get the race and religious humbugs served up constantly; Joe Chamberlain will embrace us metaphorically at dinners, and Edward the Fat will chuck the daughters of Western parvenus under the chin and speak feelingly of the President. The New York Chamber of Commerce will toast England and insult America, and the stale old programme of Anglomania will have a fine anti-Russian, instead of anti-German, tone.

Let us get ready for it and meet it with a club. Meantime our manufacturers, who are not New York importers and middlemen, will learn to appreciate the substantial gains of the Siberian and Manchurian markets and they will learn how difficult it is to sell a dollar's worth of American goods in British India. The friends of America and freedom can read the concrete proofs of British friendship in Canadian fortifications and provincial insolence; and they can estimate the value of the British love of liberty by the rotten reconcentration camps of South Africa.

Irish-Americans will stand by Russia first, last and always. She is the Nemesis of England; the power that will give the coup de grace to their ancient foe.

Ad interim let us keep an eye on the pro-British press and England's hired man in Washington, John Hay.

JOSEPH SMITH.

HAY'S SERVICES FOR ENGLAND.--HE WILL BE PRESIDENT IF ROOSEVELT DIES.

Professor Grosvenor, of Amherst College, on the State Department.

At the meeting of the Commercial Club, Boston, March 27, at which President Lucius Tuttle presided, Prof. Edwin A. Grosvenor, of Amherst College, who spent many years in the East as a teacher in Robert College in Constantinople, delivered an able address upon "Russian Expansion in the East."

Speaking of the policy of the United States, in view of Russian expansion, he said:

"The course pursued during the last few years by the American Department of State toward Russia in political questions concerning the extreme East has been peculiar. The more thoroughly that course is investigated and understood by Americans, the more it will be regretted. An American should be neither a Russophobe nor an Anglophobe; neither a Russophile nor an Anglophile. The American doctrine is that this country shall work out its destiny without entangling alliances; that in foreign matters which do not primarily concern us, but do concern two antagonistic States like Russia and Great Britain, America shall be the tool or the satellite of neither. And so it is regarded the more surprising that, while regard for American interests is the flag under which the State Department is supposed to sail, a constant and solicitous regard for British inter-

ests seems to be the rudder by which it steers.

I am not referring now to the first Hay-Panacefote treaty nor to the practical surrender in the Alaskan boundary dispute, nor to plain precepts of international law overridden to the advantage of Great Britain in her war with the Boer Republics. I am referring simply to our relations with Russia in the extreme East.

As far as our own interests are concerned, it would not be difficult to prove that the attitude of our State Department had been ill advised, and even puerile. Friendship with all the world, including Russia, should be our constant aim. Unless we receive affront or some moral principle opposes, from that aim we should not swerve. In the regions opened up by Russian enterprise and activity is our market. With the growing prosperity of Russia that market must expand. High tariff or low tariff or no tariff—as far as competition with other national producers is concerned—it is all one. That market must grow constantly more lucrative. A man or a nation will buy of a friend rather than of a stranger, provided the quality of the goods is the same. He will even prefer to buy an inferior article of a friend to a superior article from an enemy. But the policy of the State Department

has tended constantly to alienate the friendship of the nation whose friendship for us was traditional and who opens before us that ever enlarging market.

How many notes of an unfriendly or suspicious nature have been addressed by our Department of State to the Russian Government? How ostentatiously has been flaunted in the face of Russia our intimacy with Great Britain, Russia's chief and almost only antagonist? It is ill-advised for a parent or a nation to nag. But those successive notes have been diplomatic nagging. We have uttered threats against Russia

as to her possible doings in Manchuria. But does our State Department really mean to go to war with her, whatever she does in New-Chwang or Seoul? Are we partners in Anglo-Japanese alliance? We shake our fist at Russia. Do we intend to follow up that shaking of the fist by a blow? By war? And so these American notes to Russia are only puerile. For the threat is but empty sound, but it lowers our dignity and weakens our influence and tends to alienate the one Power which has been our consistent, persistent friend.

A Last Word On Pauncefote.---His American Champions Utterly Routed.---British Duplicity During the Spanish War.

An attempt has been made by certain pro-British weekly publications, notably the "Independent," the "Outlook" and "Frank Leslie's," to explain or excuse Lord Pauncefote's action in connection with his proposed collective note of April 14, 1898. These organs insinuate that the British ambassador merely acted as doyen of the Diplomatic Corps and at the suggestion or instigation of Baron Hengelmüller, the Austrian Minister.

The Austrian Foreign Office has promptly and emphatically denied any responsibility for Lord Pauncefote's now memorable note, and incontrovertible testimony has been disclosed in corroboration of that official denial. The notes to the Ambassadors inviting them to the conference at which the intervention proposal was submitted were signed by Lord Pauncefote. They were asked to meet at the British Embassy, "to-morrow morning at ten o'clock," the notes being dated April 13, to consider a proposition in regard to the Spanish-American difficulty. The notes did not state that the proposal emanated from or had been prepared by the Austrian Minister, nor did Lord Pauncefote make any such suggestion to the conference. The German Ambassador was not alone among his diplo-

matic colleagues in believing that the note originated with Lord Pauncefote, and there is no doubt now that all of them telegraphed their governments in similar language to the historic dispatch of Herr von Holleben, who said, "The British Ambassador to-day took in a very surprising way the initiative in a new collective step on the part of the Ministers."

Referring to the conference the "New York Sun," in a well informed Washington dispatch reviewing the discussion in its issue of Feb. 14, says:

"Even more interesting and important than any of the above assertions is another attributed to more than one source of authority. This is to the effect that when the representatives of the Powers assembled in the British Embassy on the morning of April 14, 1898, they found that the proposed collective note to the United States, which they were called together to consider, had been prepared in writing, and that it was in English. Lord Pauncefote was the only representative of an English-speaking people who was a party to the conference. This, taken in connection with the fact that no statement was made that the proposal came from the Austrian Minister, was pretty

strong evidence that the note was submitted in behalf of Great Britain."

If the note, as has been claimed by Lord Pauncefoot's apologists, had been presented in behalf of Austria, it is remarkable that it was written in the English tongue, and not in the diplomatic language, French. Baron Hengelmüller has neither the fluency nor facility in English to prepare a note of such importance in that language, and if it was inspired by him it certainly would have been written in French, with which all the diplomats are familiar.

There is no doubt, therefore, from all the undisputed evidence that the note was the conception of Pauncefoot, and no diplomat of his experience would have assumed the initiative in such a matter without communication with his Government and being satisfied that it coincided fully in its purport. It is fruitless, therefore, for Lord Salisbury's ministry to throw the sole blame on his Majesty's representative at Washington.

The real facts of the case are that when the foreign ministers assembled at the British Embassy on April 14 Lord Pauncefoot took from a drawer in his desk the now famous note which was in his handwriting, written on the Embassy paper and in the English language. He then requested the French Ambassador to translate it into French, which was done. The English text of the document was as follows:

"The attitude of Congress and the resolution of the House of Representatives, passed yesterday by a large majority, leave but little hope

of peace, and it is popularly believed that the warlike measures advocated have the approval of the great powers. The memorandum of the Spanish Minister, delivered on Sunday, appears to me and my colleagues to remove all legitimate cause for war. If that view should be shared by the great powers the time has arrived to remove the erroneous impression which prevails that the armed intervention of the United States in Cuba commands, in the words of the message, 'the support and approval of the civilized world.' It is suggested by the foreign representatives that this might be done by a collective expression from the great powers of the hope that the United States Government will give favorable consideration to the memorandum of the Spanish Minister, of April 10, as offering a reasonable basis for an amicable solution, and as removing any grounds for hostile intervention which may have previously existed."

Herr von Holleben, in transmitting the note to the Berlin Foreign Office, made the following significant comment thereon: "Personally I regard this demonstration somewhat coldly." The German Emperor having read the document, appended the following marginal note: "I regard it as completely futile and purposeless, and, therefore, prejudicial. I am against this step." The other Powers and their Ministers adopted a similar attitude.

But we have further information in regard to the conference. The Washington "Post," a most careful and conservative organ, has

charged our State Department with having knowledge that Pauncefote said to the foreign envoys: "In case a concert could be arranged, his Government was prepared to mobilize a fleet in the Gulf of Mexico to enforce its demands." The "Post" has repeatedly made this statement on the highest authority, and it has remained unchallenged.

The "Post" has also charged Lord Pauncefote with having made the following remark to a certain envoy: "I hope we now have these brigands (United States Government) where we want them."

Now just a word in regard to the attitude of Russia. Julian Ralph, of unenviable notoriety, lately wrote two columns in the New York "Mail and Express" to prove that Russia was the real culprit and chief organizer of the coalition. A few dinners at the mess table of Kitchener and Buller purchased the pen of this renegade American, who rivals the lowest British jingo in his foul abuse of the patriot Boers. The official journal of the Russian ministry published on February 23 an account of the actions of the ambassadors at Washington which almost textually corroborates Herr von Hölleben and the Berlin Foreign Office. The Russian statement concludes as follows:

"Russia did not agree to the presenting of the note drawn up by Lord Pauncefote, April 14, because she did not regard it as being in the nature of an amicable appeal, but considered that it tended to be an expression of disapproval of the United States policy, and that to have participated in such a note would have been contrary to the at-

titude of most scrupulous neutrality maintained by Russia throughout the war, her conduct in this respect being renewed proof of the traditional friendship of Russia and the United States."

I do not think that even Julian Ralph will have the audacity to again impugn the good faith of our traditional friend.

Great Britain's base anxiety to dampen the ardor of American friendliness for Prince Henry and the German people has proved her undoing and exposed her own duplicity. Her impudent pretensions to our friendship, based on the most contemptible fraud and cheat ever perpetrated on the credulity of a gullible people, have been at last unmasked. She stands pilloried as a hypocrite before the world, again convicted of brazen falsehood and treachery to the American Republic.

Thank Heaven! this chapter is closed. We have heard the last of the fake "How Britain saved the United States from the great Powers during the Spanish War."

T. ST. JOHN GAFFNEY.

The question as to who were our friends at the time of the outbreak of the war with Spain is set at rest by a statement received by "The Expansionist" on unimpeachable authority. The note, which, after the rejection of the first by President McKinley, was intended to be the prelude to direct intervention in some form in favor of Spain and against this country, was conceived and elaborated in confidential communications that passed between the British Government and its am-

bassador at Washington. When the ambassadors of the powers at the capital, who were convened by Lord Pauncefoot, had assembled at the British Embassy, they and their governments were in complete ignorance of the proposal that was about to be made to them. It was only after they were in the ambassador's room at the Embassy that they learned the object of their convocation, and Lord Pauncefoot, taking a document from his desk, handed it to the French Ambassador with a request that he would turn it into French for the benefit of his colleagues.

This fact fixes the responsibility for the authorship of the note where it properly belongs—on Great Britain. The reasons why the British Government refuses to publish the correspondence between it and its ambassador at Washington, to which it has been challenged by the German Government, are obvious, and need not be further commented on.—“The Expansionist,” *March*.

Canada and the Monroe Doctrine.

We find in the New York “Sun” of a very recent date a communication which has the merit of broaching a question of novel character and undoubted interest:

“To the Editor of the Sun:

“Sir: The report that Great Britain has called upon Canada to furnish 2,000 additional cavalry for South Africa suggests some grave considerations for the American Government.

“Is not the employment of Ca-

nadian troops in a war with which this hemisphere has no concern a source of danger to the Monroe doctrine?

“The Dominion, having voluntarily involved itself in a predatory war in behalf of England, cannot avoid being called upon to give military aid to the imperial authorities in the future.

“Under the Monroe doctrine we claim a paramountcy over this continent, but we cannot object to Russia or France invading and holding Canadian territory, should Canadian troops be employed against them.

“The conduct of Canada herself gives the United States the supreme right to intervene in South Africa, because it has imperilled the traditional policy of our government and estopped us from the right of protest, should her soil be seized by a continental power.

“Congress should protest, therefore, without delay against the drafting of Canadian troops in Britain's wars, unless it is prepared to abandon the rights we claim under the most vital and fundamental principle of our national policy.

“Should our government now by its silence seemingly admit the right of Great Britain to recruit her armies from her American dependencies, we may yet have to face the prospect of the dismemberment of Canada and her apportionment among the European powers when the inevitable day of reckoning comes for the British Empire.

“T. ST. JOHN GAFFNEY.

“New York, March 27.”

The matter is one which we shall have to refer to the great constitutional and international thinkers of Congress, or, barring them, to the debating society of the Columbian University school of diplomacy. As will be seen, Mr. Gaffney puts a purely hypothetical case—offers a mere suggestion. He raises an issue which can be decided only by the highest authority. England has been recruiting her armies on American soil for the purpose of waging war against a foreign country. Suppose that country, either directly or indirectly—of its own strength or through the strength of allies—should invade Canada by way of reprisal or as a means of intensifying the effect of hostile operations elsewhere; could the United States properly invoke the Monroe doctrine to antagonize that invasion? We have declared in effect that we will not permit the strengthening or the extension of foreign power in the Western Hemisphere. Do we not abandon that position,

or at least its logic, when we wink at such proceedings as those to which Mr. Gaffney refers in his communication? If the Dominion to our north is capable of contributing to England's military power for one purpose, why may it not be used for any other purpose? If Canadian troops can be employed to make war on the South African republics, why may they not be used to make war on France, Russia or Germany? And if the United States sanctions this, with what justice can we oppose measures adopted by those countries in retaliation?

The question, as it seems to us, is whether we can invoke the Monroe Doctrine only when our pleasure or our profit is involved and be free to ignore it when we have no selfish personal interest at stake. In a word, is it a principle or only a pretext—something which we can change as we do our coat to meet the emergency at hand?—Washington Post.

